REMARKS

Claims 1-4, 6-13 and 15-34 are pending. Claims 1, 2, 6, 8-11, 18, 20, 22, 26-29, 31 and 34 have been amended. No new matter has been added.

The Examiner is thanked with gratitude for the interview on August 25, 2005.

Claim 1 has been rejected under 35 USC 101 as allegedly directed to non-statutory subject matter. Applicant respectfully traverses this rejection.

Claim 1 has been amended to show a positive interrelationship between the medium and the activities recited. It is now believed that the present wording is compliant with the principles of section 101.

Claims 1-4, 6-13 and 15-34 have been rejected under 35 USC 102(b) as allegedly anticipated by Schneck, et al. Applicant respectfully traverses this rejection.

The present invention is directed to a computerized system having a computerized central network core site with at least one computer readable storage medium and a program for interesting and retaining at least one qualified purchaser or licensee of a patent or trade secret.

The program has machine readable code for permitting a purchaser to attain access to varying levels of information disclosure relating to a patent or trade secret in the computer readable storage medium based on levels of interest of the purchaser. The machine readable code protects the levels of information disclosure. Each additional level of information disclosure relating to a patent or

trade secret is more confidential and is more secure than the preceding level of disclosure.

No patent or trade secret: Schneck, et al. does not anticipate the claims under 35 USC 102(b) because the data in Schneck, et al. is not information relating to a patent or trade secret. Digital music presented in Schneck, et al. is never patented or trade secret protected. It is typically copyrighted. There is no machine readable code in Schneck, et al. for permitting a buyer and seller to exchange information and make requests relative to information relating to a patent or trade secret.

The claimed invention is also distinguishable over the downloading of a thesis from the internet as mentioned by the Examiner in the interview. The downloading of a thesis, like Schneck, et al., is also the direct downloading of a product rather than the downloading of information relating to the product. There is no downloading in a thesis of information relating to a patent or trade secret in levels that are succeeding more secure after the fulfillment of demands by the purchaser.

Product vs. information relating to patents and trade secrets:

Schneck et al. is directed to a system for the protection of a digital data music product. In Schneck, et al., the user is downloading the actual product itself. Schneck, et al. does not anticipate the present claims because Schneck et al. does not relate to information disclosure of patents or trade secrets relating to a product or method, as is required by the present claims.

The levels of disclosure in the present invention are described in the specification as being a description of patents, sales presentations focusing on the benefits (but not necessarily the specifics) of the technology, with detailed text, pictures, samples or other items normally associated with an initial sales presentation. (page 13, lines 1-8), and information regarding ability to acquire and exploit technology (Fig. 2). At the end of the process, the purchaser may obtain a full disclosure of the technology (information relating to the product) (page 13) and enter into a contract relative to the patent or trade secret. These levels of disclosure are not even mentioned in Schneck, et al.

Schneck, et al. is only directed to a system for controlling access and re-distribution of digital data such as songs. The varying levels of disclosure in Schneck, et al. are designed to protect portions of copyrighted digital data from being downloaded and pirated. An Example of a system of this nature is found on Napster, where a user can listen to a sample of a song (product) and if he likes it, he can pay for and download the whole song (product).

Intellectual property referred to in Schneck, et al.: The Examiner refers to Schneck as disclosing "intellectual property." However, Schneck, et al. does not apply to information relating to patents and trade secrets. A careful reading of column 34, lines 29-41 reveals that the term, "intellectual property" as it is used in Schneck, et al. is used loosely to refer to the physical **data or product and not the actual (intellectual property) patent or trade secret**. Again, copyrights are not patents or trade secrets. Schneck, et al. describes how it can help intellectual property (copyright) owners of digital data ...

> "the invention offers the intellectual property (copyright) owner the opportunity to restrict access and use of his or her **data** beyond the protections that may be available in law."

Hence, Schneck, et al. is attempting to avoid asserting copyrights in court by keeping the horse from leaving the barn in the first place, so to speak. This is important to note because it illustrates the differences between protecting the copyrighted product (Schneck, et al.) which is totally different than "information" about a patent or trade secret (the presently claimed invention).

As explained above, Schneck, et al. states that it offers protection (control of data distribution) beyond that available in law in the courts. (The horse never leaves the barn without payment). This helps us to better understand the quote:

> "The mechanisms discussed herein are technical in nature and are independent of any form of legal protection –a purely technological approach has been presented to controlling access to data." Schneck col. 34."

It is submitted that the present invention is not anticipated by Schneck, et al.

Reconsideration and allowance are respectfully requested.

Respectfully submitted,

Date: Sept. 1, 2005

By Caroline Nash

Caroline Nash, Reg. No. 36, 329
Nash & Titus, LLC
21402 Unison Road
Middleburg, VA 20117
(540) 554-4551
Customer No. 30951